

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
JUNE 10, 2015**

**CALL TO
ORDER
6:01 pm**

A meeting of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. at the Earl Bennett Building, Conference Rooms A and B, 1035 1st Ave W, Kalispell, Montana. Board members present were Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Tim Calaway, Kevin Lake, Ron Schlegel, Dean Sirucek, Jim Heim, Jeff Larsen, and Greg Stevens. Mike Horn had an excused absence. BJ Grieve, Rachel Ezell and Erik Mack represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

There were 10 people in the audience.

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES
6:01 pm**

There were no minutes for approval.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT
(not related to
agenda items)
6:02 pm**

None.

**DAVID
SCHMEECKLE
(FPMA-15-01)
6:02 pm**

A request by David J. Schmeeckle & Schmeeckle Brothers, LLC for an amendment to the Kalispell City-County Master Plan Year 2010, specifically the Master Plan Map. The proposed amendment would change the land use designation from "Suburban/Urban Residential" to "Light Industrial" on 5.078 acres that is currently developed with light industrial uses including mini-storage and a shop building. The property is located at 1101 Whitefish Stage Road.

STAFF REPORT

Mack reviewed Staff Report FPMA-15-01 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Heim and Mack discussed the acreage of the application, the legal description, boundary line adjustment and the discrepancy between the amounts of acreage in the staff report versus the legal notice.

Grieve explained the boundary line adjustment happened after the applicant had submitted the application to the office and after the legal and adjoining property notice had been sent out.

Schlegel and Mack clarified the acreage of the application.

The board and staff discussed the acreage which was in the application and what the board was considering at this meeting.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Eric Mulcahy, Sands Surveying, 2 Village Loop, represented the applicant. He said the applicant wanted to expand his business and discovered he was a legal non-conforming use. After discussing the dilemma with planning staff the applicant consulted Mulcahy for options. He wanted to eliminate the stigma of a non-conforming use and expand his businesses legally. The property to the south was already zoned light industrial. They were attaching on to the existing zoning. The Kalispell Growth Policy did not recognize the uses which had gone in the past years. They were applying for the master plan amendment to bring everything together. Mr. Schmeekle was present to answer any questions.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Sirucek and Mulcahy discussed the septic system and what the septic requirements were for the property. They also discussed the relationship with Evergreen Water and Sewer since they were not connected to the sewer lines.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Hickey-AuClaire confirmed no written comment had been received.

No public rose to speak.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

None.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FPMA-15-01)**

Calaway made a motion seconded by Schlegel to adopt staff report FPMA-15-01 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Stevens commented since the property was adjacent to I-1 zoning, it was his understanding the colors on the maps were not lot specific. They were general area designations. Given there was buffering considerations which may be going on between the districts, in his opinion, there did not have to be a master plan amendment to have a zone change. It was adjacent to an I-1 zone. He was making this comment because he wanted to bring up these colors on these maps were not necessarily lot specific. There were plenty of zone changes in Evergreen in which the lots were not under the 'color' generalization and had not done a master plan amendment.

Calaway said if this was a land owner initiated zone change because someone was complaining because of what the applicant was doing it would be a different story. The land owner was trying to get things right.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FPMA-15-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Hickey-AuClaire and staff briefly reviewed process.

**MAIN MOTION
TO APPROVE
BY
RESOLUTION
(FPMA-15-01)**

Heim made a motion seconded by Sirucek to adopt Staff Report FPMA-15-01 by resolution and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Sirucek asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL BY
RESOLUTION
(FPMA-15-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**DAVID
SCHMEECKLE
(FZC-15-01)
6:24 pm**

A Zone Change request in the Evergreen Zoning District by David J. Schmeeckle & Schmeeckle Brothers, LLC. The proposal would change the zoning on 5.078 acres from R-5 (Two-Family Limited Residential) to I-1 (Light Industrial). The property is located at 1101 Whitefish Stage Road.

STAFF REPORT

Mack reviewed Staff Report FZC-15-01 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Eric Mulcahy, Sands Surveying, 2 Village Loop, did not reiterate his presentation, but was available for questions.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Hickey-AuClaire confirmed no written comment had been received.

No public rose to speak.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

None.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FZC-15-01)**

Schlegel made a motion seconded by Calaway to adopt staff report FZC-15-01 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Sirucek asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FZC-15-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
CONDITIONS
(FZC-15-01)**

Calaway made a motion seconded by Stevens to adopt Staff Report FZC-15-01 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Sirucek asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
(FZC-15-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Hickey-AuClaire reviewed the process the application would follow from this point.

**GARY AND
JESSICA
KRUEGER
(FZC-15-03)
6:34 pm**

A Zone Change request in the Highway 93 North Zoning District by Gary and Jessica Krueger. The proposal would change the zoning on two (2) parcels containing 109.45 acres from AG-40 (Agricultural) to SAG-5 (Suburban Agricultural). The properties are located off Fox Farm Road.

Larsen recused himself from consideration. He had not done work on this application however he had done considerable work for the applicant in the area.

STAFF REPORT

Grieve reviewed Staff Report FZC-15-03 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Schlegel and Grieve discussed the weed control plan, if it took into account subdivision review and if another agreement would be needed.

Sirucek ask Grieve for clarification on finding-of-fact #2.

Sirucek and Grieve discussed at length other zones which would support agricultural use better than SAG-5, other agricultural zones, what the applicant requested which was SAG-5 and surrounding land uses. The also discussed the designated land use map which was not intended to be a future land use map.

Grieve said the Riverdale Neighborhood Plan which was an adopted plan did designate the property as residential suburban which was two and a half to five acre lots. Flathead County had adopted a future land use map which designated the property as two and a half to five acre lots. But Riverdale was also very clear that just because a property had a certain land use designation, did not mean that it could be zone changed overnight. The infrastructure had to be in place for the particular requested zoning even though the map anticipated the future. If the infrastructure was not available right now when you were not going to build it, it may not be appropriate at this time.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Erica Wirtila, Sands Surveying, represented the applicant. She read the definition from the Flathead County Zoning Regulations of SAG-5 to the board. She had always seen SAG-5 as a transitional zone between large agricultural tracts and high density residential lots. This application was a nice example of that transition. She pointed out it was a nice zone change application because it was in the Riverdale Neighborhood Plan which was very specific because it called out allowing this type of zoning on these properties. She briefly explained the Riverdale Plan and the process which had been followed in its formation. She talked about the floodplain which was contained on the property adjacent to the river, the zone change would be an extension of an existing SAG-5 zone and the weed issue had been addressed by staff. She said they were in compliance with the 13 criteria as called out by the state statute. She and the applicant were available for questions.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Stevens said Grieve had mentioned the land use designations were predicated on the fact the infrastructure would be available for that type of a zone change. He asked how they would get a 60 foot road access on the northern parcel.

Stevens, Wirtila and Gary Krueger, applicant, discussed at length where the access could be placed, if there was enough room, when the boundary line adjustment was done and where an easement had been placed earlier.

Grieve and Stevens debated what was required for subdivision as far as right of way.

The board and Grieve discussed what was required for internal roadways, potential problems in the future with possible subdivision, subdivisions in the area and an easement which had been granted to Harvest View Subdivision next to the applicant's property.

Gary Krueger, applicant, said talking about subdivision at this time was getting a little ahead of what the thoughts were on the property. He explained the access to the property. He believed it was a shared access with the secondary access to Harvest View estates. He continued to talk about the solid base of the Riverdale Plan with providing for transitional zoning and SAG-5 was the best fit for the property. His property was the boundary and buffer between agricultural uses and higher density lots. It was a density which was allowed. The zoning designation of SAG-5 was the best fit for the area. The application complied with the Growth Policy and The Riverdale Plan. If and when there was a subdivision, or should there be a subdivision plan in the future, all road accesses would be clearly understood on how they work. That would be a process not even in the works at this time. This was planning for future estate planning and so on. Part of this was how they were going to plan on dealing with the properties they own. SAG-5 allowed them to anticipate those changes. He had no intention of going through processes which were not legally available. He asked that they be allowed to have the same densities as his neighbors. He reviewed the changes in property designations in his area. The zone change allowed him to plan for the future. It was a natural progression of the area.

Schlegel and Krueger discussed why he chose SAG-5 instead of SAG-10.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Hickey-AuClaire confirmed the board had enough time to adequately review the written comment.

G.W. Ingham, owns the property adjacent to the applicant, spoke about which parts of his property would be affected by the zone change, the area was relatively pristine, it was a little early to break up the property, the existing subdivisions were not filled at this time and preserving the open spaces. He was against the SAG-5 zoning in the application.

Schlegel clarified what Ingham was against.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

Krueger reviewed what needed to be looked at when looking at a zone change as an applicant. There was no basis for going to AG-20 because it was not in the Riverdale Plan. The plan did not anticipate looking at AG-20 for the area. On this piece of property the plan anticipated two and a half to five acre lots. There was no basis to go to 20 acres. It was not in the Riverdale Plan. It was not anticipated. The plan anticipated the area was changing toward residential and on this piece of property it said the lot size could potentially be two and a half acres. He understood two and a half acres was too high of a density. There would have to be a lot of infrastructure built. As an applicant, he looked at what could be done with the property as far as a zone change and it was to SAG-5. That was what the county had adopted in the past. If those things needed to be changed, then they needed to go through the process to change the Riverdale Plan and say no, these properties need to be 20 acres and so on. He was following what the plans had set out.

Stevens and Krueger discussed what crops were currently on the property.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

Grieve could confirm there was a 60 foot easement at the corner of the property. The mitigation offered by the list of uses in a SAG-5 under conditional uses, mitigated on a case by case basis the impacts. The subdivision to the southwest had an overall gross density of 3.48 acres per lot because they had a clustering bonus. Five acre lots were not unprecedented in the area. If the applicant had come in with an application for two and a half acres which required paved roads, Fox Farm road was not paved. An R-2.5 application would be a totally different staff report. Given what the plan contemplated and the statements made in the plan, he stood by the staff report.

Sirucek asked if Krueger had contemplated a conservation easement on the property.

Krueger said he had not and personally he would scold anybody on the Planning Board that would make conservation easements part of planning and zoning.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FZC-15-03)**

Sirucek made a motion seconded by Heim to adopt staff report FZC-15-03 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FZC-15-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
CONDITIONS
(FZC-15-03)**

Heim made a motion seconded by Lake to adopt Staff Report FZC-15-03 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Calaway had been against SAG-5 in his years on the board because it was too large to mow and too small to farm. He was against them unless they were clustered. At this point the board could not condition clustering, because the applicant was not asking for a subdivision. A lot of SAG-5 properties were in the county and were weeds or junk and it became a problem. He would put a condition on it for clustering, except it was not possible to put such a condition on a zone change. He also felt it was premature to zone change to five acre lots. Until they saw more development on other properties which had been zoned in this manner, then he could say he would be more positive about changing the zoning on this property. He thought AG-20 was a good idea. He was against SAG-5 because of what he had seen. He knew a lot of people wanted to have SAG-5 lots and their intentions were good. He thought at this point the zone change was premature.

Stevens said the Riverdale Plan had to be consistent with the Growth Policy concerning policies regarding agriculture. There was a lot of productive agricultural land out there that would go away. He understood what Calaway was talking about. Ten acres you could still hay, five you could not. If it had come in as a zone change to ten or twenty acres, he would have less concern. His questions concerning access to the northern parcel of the property had been answered. He would have been happier if it would have been SAG-5 on the southern parcel only. The fact was there was SAG-5 around the property. When property was zoned with five acres they ended up as weed patches. He reviewed subdivisions which had clustered the property to keep an agricultural view. He said Flathead County was 90 % owned by either the federal government or the state government or was large tract industrial timber lands that were essentially undevelopable. As long as 90 % of the county was devoted to animals, did they need to get too cranked up about the 10% left to people. He thought Sirucek was eluding the same thing when he asked Grieve if there was an alternative to SAG-5 on the property. He asked Grieve if it was possible to approve SAG-5 on the southern part of the parcel and not on the northern.

Grieve quoted from the Subdivision Regulations the options to grant, amend or deny the application.

Stevens, Hickey-AuClaire and Grieve discussed process.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO
AMEND FZC-15-
03 TO DELETE
THE NORTH
SECTION OF
THE
APPLICATION**

Stevens made a motion to delete the north parcel of the property from the application.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The board and Grieve discussed process.

Sevens withdrew his motion.

The board and Grieve continued to discuss process.

Schlegel said the property in the application was a beautiful area. Whether Krueger wanted to scold someone or not for just

bringing up a conservation easement, sometimes it was good for a neighborhood, sometimes it was not. He didn't think anyone needed to be scolded about it. He agreed it would be nice to keep more of this farmland in place as much as possible. He also said he would not have a problem with 20 acres. He was in agreement with Ingham. He wished the application had been for 20 acres instead of five.

Heim said it was a natural transition area. There were other high density subdivisions in the area. It was close to the highway and in transition. He would vote to approve the application.

Sirucek didn't like what was happening in the lower valley with the five acre parcels and the associated problems with that acreage. If they were setting up planning to develop this type of residential/agricultural system then they needed to also set some guidelines for management practices defined to those lands. Right now, they were doing one part but not the other. It wasn't working in his mind at all. He had a problem with SAG-5. At the same time, he would not say Krueger's farmland was the most prime farmland in the valley. He had a problem with SAG-5 and wished it was something else.

Lake understood the concern about weeds, but that was not the board's place. That was the Weed Department's concern. He agreed with Heim in that this application was the natural transition. He was for the application.

Hickey-AuClaire agreed with points on both sides of the argument. She was not a fan of SAG-5. She would vote for the application because the area was a transition between agricultural and higher density zones. If they denied the application, she would wonder why other people in the area were able to have SAG-5 zoning and this application was denied. To her, that was being selective. If she owned the property, she would want to plan for the future but she most likely would not want to be doing a subdivision at this time either. In looking around the property, there were many subdivisions in which lots were not selling so it might not be the best time to subdivide. She understood having options down the road. She was not a fan of SAG-5 but she would vote for the application because she felt the Riverdale Plan and the Growth Policy supported it and it was a natural transition area. She was a part of the committee

which put together the Riverdale Plan so she knew how much thought and energy went into the plan.

Stevens wanted to comment on the concept of conservation easements. He had seen some of the biggest family tragedies because of them. He went on to describe some of the problems which were severe restrictions which basically destroyed the use of the property. He wondered if conservation easements were sometimes put in place by people who were competent enough to understand the implications of what was going down the line for their heirs and the people who came after them. To put their wishes in place in perpetuity seemed to him to be the height of hubris. He was nervous when he heard of any conservation easements because he had seen some very sad consequences.

Schlegel said he would agree however he had seen some conservation easements which had worked out very well.

Calaway said it was a transitional area. It was five acres and it was someone else's problem when weeds from the neighbor's yard were blowing into theirs.

Calaway and Lake discussed the problems with weeds and larger acreage.

Calaway said if he knew for a fact that Kruger was going to cluster a possible subdivision, clustering worked. He had seen ten acre parcels people had taken very good care of. Five acres was hard to take care of. At this point it was just a zone change. He was handicapped at this time and it bugged him that he was handicapped. He would like to say he would approve the application if he could get a letter from Krueger saying that he was going to cluster the subdivision if he subdivided. There were a lot of good reasons to cluster. To divide 100 and some acres into five acre lots, he choked on that. He would always choke on it because he had seen what happens. Unless he got a guarantee that someone was going to do it right and properly, he could not approve the application. Clustering was the way to go. Just because someone else had SAG-5 zoning, so be it. They had SAG-5 zoning. If they wanted to continue the mistake of SAG-5, that was on them. The SAG-5's which were approved before the responsibility was on another board. There were probably different circumstances. He thought this zone change was slightly premature and if he could say to cluster, he would

approve.

Wirtila asked to be recognized.

Hickey-AuClaire asked if there was any more discussion. With no board members speaking, she recognized Wirtila.

Wirtila said what the board had to realize was that a zone change at this stage of the game was estate planning. To do a family transfer, Krueger could not even transfer five acres to his children at this time with the existing 40 acre limit on it now. Farmers did not have a lot of cash, what they had a lot of was land. So when farmers wanted to send their kids to college or retire, they had the land in the bank instead of pulling out a big wad of bills from their wallet. When they said estate planning and looking into the future, maybe not clustering, they had not even talked about subdividing. When she saw a farmer come into her and talked about estate planning, looking to the future for their kids or a parent who was aging, that was why a zone change was looked at. It freed up the property to give flexibility to give your kid five acres or move your parent closer to you if needed. She wanted to divert the discussion from the zone change would be done and the next month they would come in for a subdivision. She thought they were looking at long range estate planning with the zone change.

Calaway commented Krueger could give his parent ten acres.

Heim said if SAG-5 was a mistake, then the option shouldn't be on the list of legitimate zones to ask for. He thought they had a long time property owner who was making a legitimate request off a menu of what choices for zoning the county had provided.

Hickey-AuClaire said that went back to what Sirucek said concerning doing one side of the equation being done with zoning and not the other. They could probably look at a lot of other zones.

ASK THE QUESTION

Heim asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
(FZC-15-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 4-2 with Calaway and Stevens dissenting and Schlegel abstaining.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The board and Grieve discussed process with a 4-2 with one abstaining vote.

The board took a break from 7:52 to 8:00 pm

Hickey-AuClaire said Grieve did look up the bylaws for a quorum. She read from the bylaws what constituted a quorum. The board had a quorum in attendance and a majority of the quorum had voted in favor of the previous application. The board and Grieve discussed what constituted a quorum.

**RIDGELINE
CABINS
(FPP-15-01)
8:03 pm**

A request from Ridgeline Cabins LLC for Preliminary Plat approval of Ridgeline Cabins, a 15-lot residential major subdivision on 12.7 acres, which would replace 5 lots currently located within the Eagle Development Phase 3. All proposed lots would be served by a public water and sewer system. The property is located approximately 1 mile south of Lakeside and accessed by Ridge Line Drive from Highway 93.

Calaway recused himself from hearing the application.

STAFF REPORT

Ezell reviewed Staff Report FPP-15-01 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Larsen confirmed Lakeside Community Council (LCC) approved the application.

Stevens confirmed Ezell wrote the staff report and commended her on her work.

Heim and Ezell discussed the will serve letter from Lakeside Water and Sewer.

Sirucek and Ezell discussed at length timber production on the property. They also discussed the road system, where the road appeared to dead end, the fire plan and if it met all three conditions for the fire district request.

The board discussed what conditions had been met by the ten thousand gallon water tank placed on the property.

Ezell said the Lakeside/Somers Fire District said there needed to be three water sources to be located on the subdivision in order to be annexed. The Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) provided comment after the ten thousand gallon water tank was in the application. Their comments were based on that knowledge.

The board and Ezell discussed the available water sources in the subdivision and what recommendations or conditions they met.

Stevens said it was his understanding timber productivity was a function of the soils, moisture, steepness of the slope and if the slope was facing north or south. He explained his comment.

Stevens and Sirucek briefly discussed if the site would be productive for timber.

Ezell and Sirucek discuss erosion control on the slopes where the road cut in to the slopes.

The board discussed what condition addressed Sirucek's concerns.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Marc Leichti, APEC Engineering, 111 Legend Trail represented the applicant. He had not prepared a presentation but was available for questions. He reviewed what had happened at the LCC meeting. The covenants (CCRs) or Home Owners Association from the Lakeside Club had supported the project twice before. This specific area which had been identified in the CCRs as an area which should be a cluster development. They said this was basically setting aside area for the future. The area according to the Lakeside Neighborhood Plan was an area which should be clustered. They were increasing the density in the area now and in the future there would be open space. He was available for questions from the board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Sirucek and Liechti discussed the topography of the lots and how the water from the runoff would be handled.

The board and Leichti discussed the storm water plan at length.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Hickey-AuClaire confirmed the board had adequate time to review the written comments.

No public rose to comment.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

None.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FPP-15-01)**

Stevens made a motion seconded by Sirucek to adopt staff report FPP-15-01 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FPP-15-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Grieve and Hickey-AuClaire briefly reviewed process.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
CONDITIONS
(FPP-15-01)**

Larsen made a motion seconded by Heim to adopt Staff Report FPP-15-01 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Sirucek and Ezell discussed if the second access was identified as a condition.

Larsen asked the applicants if they were comfortable with the conditions on the application.

Leichti said they were good with the conditions. There were pioneer roads to connect with the road in the subdivision. There were not official roads as of yet. Another phase of the subdivision would oversee the connectivity of the development as

a whole.

Larsen said the smaller lots were good. They had the Lakeside sewer system which was one of the best in his opinion for treating affluent. It was good for the smaller lots to use.

Sirucek said he had worked on post fire rehab projects and had seen too many subdivisions with one way in and one way out in forested subdivisions. In many cases, it was just plain luck that no one burned up. He felt that was a deal breaker on this application. Other than that, he liked the design. With the right conditions, it was a bad situation waiting to happen. He would like to know if there was some potential to gain access to the south.

Heim wanted to ask the engineers if there was a road they could drive on.

Leichti explained other roads which offered other ways to access the subdivision.

Leichti and the board discussed the access roads, if they were drivable and what could be used if there was a fire.

Schlegel and Leichti discussed how many of the lots were vacant and how many had been sold.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
(FZC-15-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Hickey-AuClaire reviewed the process the application would follow from this point on.

Grieve reviewed how an abstention was counted according to Robert's Rules revised and the differences between the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment.

The board and Grieve discussed what an abstention meant.

Grieve said this was his last meeting as planning director and thanked the board for their work.

The board commended Grieve on his work as director.

Sirucek and Grieve discussed what was on the agenda for the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS None.
8:48 pm

NEW BUSINESS None.
8:48 pm

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:48 pm. on a
8:48 pm motion by Heim. The next meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on
July 8, 2015.

Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Chairman

Donna Valade, Recording Secretary

*APPROVED AS **SUBMITTED**/CORRECTED: 7 / 8 / 15*